



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

BC8

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/503,482 02/14/00 TAKAHASHI

Y 35.G1872D

005514 WM31/0424
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK NY 10112

EXAMINER

POPOVICI, D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2622

5

DATE MAILED:

04/24/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/503,482

Applicant(s)

Yoshinori Takahashi

Examiner

Dov Popovici

Group Art Unit

2622

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/28/2000
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 45-53 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 45-53 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Dov Popovici
DOV POPOVICI
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2622

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 45-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki (U.S. 5,228,118) in view of Gase et al (U.S. 5,580,177).

As to claim 45, Sasaki discloses an information processing apparatus comprising: an inquiry circuit (see figures 1-2: inquiring means) adapted for making an inquiry about a printer language supported by the printer (see figures 1 and 2) connected to the network; and a receiver (see column 2, line 60 to column 3, line 13) adapted for receiving information about the printer language supported by the printer, wherein the information is sent in response to the inquiry (see column 2, line 60 through column 3, line 13). Sasaki discloses changing of the printer from one type to another (see column 2, lines 3-4 and 49-50).

Sasaki does not teach a determination circuit adapted for determining a presence or an absence of a printer connected to a

Art Unit: 2622

network. Sasaki does not specify making an inquiry about a printer language supported by the printer connected to the network if the determination circuit determines the presence of the printer connected to the network.

Gase et al teaches a printing network having a plurality of clients (10, 12 and 14) connected to a server (16), and the server (16) is further connected to a plurality of printers (18, 20 and 22) (see figure 1). Gase et al teaches a determination circuit adapted for determining a presence or an absence of a printer connected to a network (see column 1, lines 43-48); and making an inquiry about a printer language supported by the new added printer connected to the network if the determination circuit determines the presence of the new added printer connected to the network (i.e., if a new printer is added or connected to the network, a new printer driver must be installed on the client host computer, so that the client will be able to use or print on the newly added printer) (see column 1, lines 43-48).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Sasaki wherein: the information processing apparatus includes a determination circuit adapted for

Art Unit: 2622

determining a presence or an absence of a printer connected to a network, and wherein the inquiry circuit is adapted for making an inquiry about a printer language supported by the printer connected to the network if the determination circuit determines the presence of the printer is connected to the network.

It would have been obvious to one person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Sasaki by the teaching of Gase et al because of the following reason(s): (1) for the reasons taught by Gase et al (see column 1, lines 43-48); and (2) to determine when a newly added printer is added or connected to the network, so that the network or the clients or the users, will be aware of the newly added or connected printer, and to inquire as to what kind of printer languages are supported by the newly added printer, therefore, the users or clients will be able to use or employ the newly added or connected printer.

As to claim 46, Sasaki as modified discloses wherein the determination circuit determines the presence or the absence of the printer connected to the network by inquiring about management information base information to the network (see Gase et al, see column 1, lines 43-48).

Art Unit: 2622

As to claim 47, Sasaki as modified discloses a display circuit (41 and 42) adapted for displaying on a display a message (see fig. 6, S15 and S18 and see fig. 8, S34) indicating that the printer language supported by the printer is unidentifiable if the receiver does not receive information about the printer language supported by the printer (see column 8, lines 24-43 and column 10, lines 47-54).

As to claims 48-50, Sasaki discloses an information processing method. The steps of method claims 48-50 claim subject matter corresponding to and similar to the claimed limitations that are found in the information processing apparatus claims of claims 45-47. Therefore, claims 48-50 are similarly rejected.

As to claims 51-53, Sasaki discloses a computer-readable storage medium for storing a program for implementing an information processing method. The program codes of the computer-readable storage medium of claims 51-53 claim subject matter corresponding to and similar to the claimed limitations that are found in the information processing apparatus claims of claims 45-47. Therefore, claims 51-53 are similarly rejected.

Art Unit: 2622

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dov Popovici whose telephone number is (703) 305-3830.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:


(703) 308-9051 (for formal communications intended for entry)

(703) 308-5397 (for informal or draft communications, such as proposed amendments to be discussed at an interview; please label such communications "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

or hand-carried to:

Crystal Park Two
2121 Crystal Drive
Arlington, VA.
Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

Dov Popovici
April 20, 2001


DOV POPOVICI
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Dov Popovici
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2622